

Dr. Gary Aguilar  
909 Hyde St., #530  
San Francisco, CA 94109

2/16/95

Dear Gary,

At the end of your undated here today you ask about my new book. I sent you the Carroll & Graf catalogue page as soon as I got it. NEVER AGAIN! Due in April and I'm struggling with proofs because there was butchery, not like with Case Open but a real problem that is taking much time and they want me to rush.

It was for it that I'd asked you <sup>what</sup> you now answer. Too late for it but glad to have it and thanks for it.

A general addressing of what I think I've mentioned, perhaps in a different way before. And in general a belief in William of Occam, paraphrased <sup>no</sup> keep it simple. All of you and all others who believe the back of JFK's head was blown out have the Zapruder film to contend with. And of course, Livingston's coming book has what for him and his blurbing is scientific proof the film was fake. It has to be for him or he cannot face himself.

Lifton has an excellent print, the very best he could steal. Which he did. So get him to project <sup>it</sup> for you and study it carefully right after the last the WC published, 334. I did that, using a slide made from the original at the Archives when my exposure of their not printing <sup>the</sup> frames they were to have printed forced them to put that and the others of those nine in the tray of what could be viewed. It was long ago and ~~despite~~ despite care I may have missed something, but I do not recall seeing a hair out of place or any damage on the back of the head. <sup>no</sup> ~~no~~ <sup>look</sup> on the collar or <sup>shirt</sup> ~~shirt~~. I do not think it is possible to prove any faking of that film and I do not believe it was faked. In any event, until you are past that you are spinning wheels and wasting time. It has to be disproven first. If that cannot be done, take a different course of the many that are open.

You say on 4 to get a reference from me. I do not recall it.

Crouch gave me a set of autopsy ~~books~~ <sup>books</sup>. I glanced at them and have not used them save for referring to one of the back of ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup>.

On the second head wound (which I first postulated and then underwrote in Whitewash II fearing reaction to it, look at the middle of page 7 of the Humes holography in Post mortem and see how he <sup>described</sup> ~~described~~ the wound he did place at the top of the head. You can read it though the corrections made under Galloway's orders the evening of 11/24/63. It says it was a penetrating wound tangential to the surface of the scalp.

I heard the same about ~~the~~ Mailer's book. Newman told me two weeks ago that he is having trouble with the final chapters, now yet drafted. And Lifton's book was due last year, as I recall.

Thanks and best to you all,

Hardy

2/18 p.s. I've been told that you and Mantik are working on a book. Good luck with it, and feel free to use anything of mine that may interest you.

But especially for a book I urge you as strongly as I can to address what the Z film shows. I think clearly.

The faking of that film is a major part of Livingstone's coming Killing Kennedy. If any effort is made to counter it you and Mantik can be the victims of it if you in effect or specifically say or argue essentially what he does.

I've seen the clearest possible slides projected to about 5 feet in width and am pretty clear on what I saw.

In assessing this I urge you, aside from common sense, to speak to those who are experts in the area to learn whether something so small as 8mm with the head so minuscule a part of that can be altered and the alteration not detected with so great a magnification of it.

I have the right to make individual prints or slides from the film. Groden had promised to do that and then backed out. I could not and cannot afford that. The right was not for publishing, for study only. Jim handled it if you and Mantik want to do that but I think examination of a good VCR cassette will be informative enough.

And my opinion, for what it is worth, is that critical attention is more likely for a pair of doctors than for a nut like Livingstone.

You'd be examined as he was not. His craziness is like for the FBI Cointelpro was, or his nutty stuff is liked by the government. It undermines all work.

You do not want to do all the work involved and then be blown out of the water.

So in your own interests I urge you to satisfy yourselves what Mantik discovered what you'll be saying in the book it means.

H